

REMARKS

Claims 1-14 are pending in this patent application with no claims amended or cancelled herein. No new matter is added by these amendments.

Initially, the office action objects to the drawings alleging that they fail to show each and every element of the claims. In response, the specification as been amended herein to provide tag numbers for the reservoir and clutch, and Figs. 3 and 5 are amended herein to include these tag numbers as well as a reservoir. Support for the reservoir can be derived from the claims themselves as originally filed as well as the specification in the paragraph beginning at page 5 line 20. New drawings 3 and 5 bearing the header REPLACEMENT SHEET are submitted herewith. Withdrawal of the objection is requested.

In the office action claims 1-4, 8 and 10 are rejected under either 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by French Patent No. 2148705 to Soulier. Claims 5-7, 9, and 11-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over FR in view of European Patent No. 0945728 to Scatizzi. These rejections are respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

The office action alleges that the relied upon portions of Soulier teach an apparatus including a "movable head mounted on an automated motion control system for controlling movement of the moveable head in the X, Y and Z directions," as recited in claim 1. However, the Examiner's attention is directed to the abstract of the invention which clearly states that the invention there includes "means of carriage assembled to displacement along **two directions.**" (Soulier at Abstract). In looking at the Figures, it appears looking at Fig. 1, that the "movable head" shown there can move vertically. Further, review of Figs. 7 and 8 appear to show that to dispense from the syringes the head does not move, but rather a screw 116 drives an element 119 to depress the plungers of the syringes. Finally, looking at Fig. 10, it is unclear how the elements

shown therein relate to the device shown in Fig. 1, but even if it is alleged that element 160 moves vertically, this is only a portion of the total "movable head" or carriage 36 of the device shown there, the whole "movable head" does not move in X, Y, and Z directions as recited in claim 1 of the instant application. Support for this interpretation can also be found in the abstract which describes a "crew" moving independent of the carriage in a perpendicular direction. But again this an element is independent of the "movable head" of claim 1, as recited herein.

Accordingly, it is submitted that the relied upon portions of Soulier fail to teach each and every element of independent claim 1, which is therefore allowable. Claims 10 and 13 contain similar recitations and are therefore similarly allowable. Claims 2-9, 11-12, and 14 depend from one of these allowable base claims and are therefore allowable therewith.

Conclusion

In view of the remarks and amendments set forth above, this application is in condition for allowance which action is respectfully requested. However, if for any reason the Examiner should consider this application not to be in condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the number listed below prior to issuing a further Action.

Any fee due with this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-1290.

Respectfully submitted,

/Nathan Weber/
Nathan Weber
Reg. No. 50,958

CUSTOMER NUMBER 026304
FBR 20.750 (031035-00062)
Ph: 212.940.8564